

SUBJECT: Leonid Hermanovich BULEBENKO alias Oleksiy BULEBENKO

SOURCE: E

DATE: 4 Dec 1963

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3B2  
VAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

1. After futile attempts to reach Subject by telephone on 18 and 19 Nov 1963 at the Soviet Delegation to the UN, Source phoned on 26 Nov 1963 at 9.15 hrs LE 5-3418 and asked again for Subject by his last name. He was told that Subject was just having his breakfast and one could reach him in about 30 minutes. At 9.45 hrs Source talked by telephone to Subject to whom he introduced himself by his first name and a friend of PIDSUKHA, Alexandr. They fixed an appointment for 30 Nov 1963 at ~~1600~~ 16.00 hrs on the corner of 57th Street and 3rd Avenue. Without ascertaining who Source was Subject assured him that he will recognize him somehow.

2. On 30 Nov 1963 at 16.15 hrs at the fixed place Subject approached suddenly Source and asked whether he was waiting for him. He introduced himself as Oleksiy and by his last name. According to the Source Subject had probably arrived by car in company of someone who knew Source and pointed him to the Subject.

The latter asked what Source wanted to meet him for. Referring to his talks with Arkadiy who promised at one time to eventually arrange the presentation at the Ukrainian Club or privately of a member of Ukrainian Mission to the UN with a paper on international status of the Ukr SSR and activities of its Mission in New York, Source explained that he was going to ask about it now Subject. Then he added that what he actually had in mind was a private meeting or rather party since he was no longer chairman of the Ukrainian Club. Asked why exactly he choose Subject, Source replied that because of his pure Ukrainian name and his function as the Second Secretary of the Ministry of

new copy in R.V. Stakhan file

4 Dec 63  
M 124-2412

Foreign Af airs about what he read in "The Ukrainian News" of 85 East 4th Street, New York, N.Y.

Subject seemed to be very happy and pleased with Source's suggestion and regretted very much that he did not contact him sooner, still before his chief, Minister PALAMARCHUK departed. Because Subject was sure that PALAMARCHUK would have been only too glad to read such a paper and at such a forum himself. As to Subject himself he did not think to be the best choice, there were more representable people for such purposes. In his opinion either KYZIA or still better his immediate chief POLANYCHKO could perform instead of him. He also mentioned something to the effect that KYZIA was the one who gave permission to meet Source. Anyway, Subject will gladly present the case to his bosses but even now he was sure that such a meeting could be arranged, preferably on 13 or 14 Dec 1963. For final reply and arrangement he will meet Source again on 5 Dec 1963 at 18 hrs at the same place ( corner of 57th St and 3rd Ave ).

3. The encounter with Subject lasted from 16.15 to 21.15 hrs. They talked in the street, then in a restaurant, and finally went to a bar. Subject had 4 or 5 scotch but mostly drank beer. In the restaurant they had dinner. All drinks paid Source and dinner - Subject. He insisted on paying it. The costs were more or less "evenly shared".

XX

4. At the very beginning Subject ascertained whether Source was brother of one of the editors of "Suchasnist" in Munich, Germany and what were his political affiliations. He knew about "Suchasnist" because they all read it in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Kiev, and also mentioned the article by Source's brother in "Suchasnist" which attacked the Foreign Minister PALAMARCHUK.

Later on, Subject wanted to know what kind of political and socio-economic system Source was for, whether he wanted a restoration of capitalism, why did he propound a separation of the Ukraine from Russia, etc.

Subject's main contention was that the Ukraine was at the present better off than ever before, that there was no need for separation from Russia because this would mean "a historical regress" and great damage to Ukrainian nation, that there was no Russification as a policy line in the Ukraine but that he had to admit that many things were still in need of correction and modification. All could not be done at once, the progress might be slow and full of setbacks but nevertheless it is a progress in comparison with Stalin's <sup>w/s</sup> times. He assured the Source that he, no less, <sup>a</sup> Ukrainian patriot than his interlocutor and together with his friends in the Ukraine were doing what they could for Ukrainian people. But again, he had to stress that the separation of the Ukraine from Russia would be harmful because the Ukraine as a state and nation can only exist in union and with backing of Russian nation. Without Russia the Ukraine would have ~~had~~ disappeared a long time ago under attacks of Poles, and Germans. It is no secret that Russians saved Ukrainians from Hitler's genocide.

In addition there were now significant positive elements demonstrating clearly the strength of Ukrainian element on all-union scale and they were to be appreciated. For example: BREZHNEV is a Ukrainian from DNEPROPETROVSK, many ministers and vice-ministers in Moscow are Ukrainians, so are a great many marshals and generals in the Soviet Army, scientists at Academies and others. KHRUSHCHEV himself is a half-Ukrainian. No wonder that more and more Russians complain openly that they are being ruled by Ukrainians.

There was also no need for separate diplomatic relations of the Ukrainian SSR with foreign countries. First, because the interests of the Ukraine were properly taken care by all-union diplomatic service, and second, in the latter again Ukrainians were predominant: MEDOZHIKO is a Ukrainian, the head of Belarusian Mission is a Ukrainian, too, and many a Ukrainian serves in diplomatic and other foreign office posts, both, abroad and in Moscow.

5. Subject asked Source whether his group was publishing some magazines or papers in the USA. After source's negative reply Subject mentioned "The Prologue" and on this occasion wanted to know whether the US-Government helped in any way Ukrainian emigration. He pointed to the fact that even the late President KENNEDY sent some greetings to Ukrainian emigre celebrations here in the States. Source explained that Ukrainians in this country are mostly American citizens and they are usually addressed as such by Presidents and other prominents. This is usual also with other ethnic groups like Poles, Italians, Jews ~~and others~~ etc. Subject did not probe anymore on the topic.

6. Asked whether the Soviet Government will allow Metropolit SLIPYI to return to the Ukraine, Subject replied that this will depend on the Metropolit himself. As a Soviet citizen the Metropolit can always go back to the Soviet Union. Subject was reluctant to elaborate on that.

7. According to Subject, SHILHEVYTSKYI was demoted for his lack of qualities of a practical politician. He was above all a theoretician, highly educated and articulated, but with little sense for hard realities of daily politics. Now he was in Dnepropetrovsk Obkom.

8. Subject attacked Ukrainian emigration for its collaboration with Germans; in particular he was very vehement about banderivtsi under which he understood actually all nationalists; mentioned celebration of SS Division Galicia anniversary which to him was just another additional proof that Ukrainian emigres even here in the States remained German lackeys.

9. On the other hand, Subject wondered why Ukrainian emigrants in the States boycotted the Soviet Ukrainian Mission in New York, why nobody came to talk to them, why no one was interested in developing cultural and social contacts between the people in the Ukraine and the emigration.

10. Subject recommended Source to visit the Ukraine as a tourist and be his guest in Kiev. He assured that nothing bad happens to him if he has no blood on his hands. In Kiev, at Subject's home they could talk just as freely as here in New York. Asked whether KYZIA could guarantee Source's return from the Ukraine, Subject assured him that KYZIA would do so. On this occasion Subject asked Source whether he had any friends in Kiev or Lviv. Source replied that none but after a while returned to the topic again and said that actually he had ~~one~~: this was Myron MATVIEJKO. "O, yes, I know - said Subject - he was dropped by parachute, by BADEA, caught by our NKVD or KGB or whatever they are called now, the hell knows, and then he wrote a pamphlet about Ukrainian nationalists."

Asked why Soviet authorities refused tourists to visit Vil ages Subject replied that this was a retaliation for restriction imposed on Soviet tourists in this country and other capitalist states.

11. According to Subject "The Washington Post" sent a letter to the Ukrainian Soviet Mission in New York asking them for their opinion on erection of Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C. Subject translated the letter for his boss KYZIA and as far as he knew KYZIA'S answer to "The Washington Post" was in favor of erecting the monument. The copy of KYZIA'S reply was also sent to Ukrainian "progressive" press in Canada and the US. Subject promised to bring the copy to Source, too.

12. As said people and his friends will be in their delegation in Kiev, Subject mentioned MAX LIEB, VOLKOV, and VLADEIKO, whom one could always approach and talk with to , after the members of the Delegation leave for the Ukraine. Subject himself was not sure whether he will stay here after the UI session ending 13 Dec 1973.

13. Subject claimed not to know a BRYN HEDO from the Ministry of Foreign

Affairs in Kiev. He knew about recent memorandum of the UHVR to NATO countries but again he was against direct diplomatic relations between Kiev and foreign countries.

14. Subject read in Kiev "Suchasnist" and other emigre publications. Besides, they have also at their Ministry special bulletins on Ukrainian emigre affairs and that's why he is quite familiar with them.

15. When discussing the paper to be read by someone from the Mission Subject asked who actually would come to the meeting. Source replied that he will have first to talk to various people but he thought ,for instance, ~~zdu~~ of HOLUBNICHY, NOVÝTER, KOSTIUK, and people from other groups as well.

1. Physical Description. 5'10-5'11, 170 lb, well built, aged 35-40, black hair combed straight back, grey-brown eyes, black brows, long face, straight nose, sympathetic, smooth. Seems to be of lower intelligence and experience than TSURKAN, V.

2. Biographic Data. Subject stated his name as Leonid BOLBOTENKO but asked to call him simply Oleksiy. He stemmed from VASILKIV-r-n, was married, his wife was Russian, had two sons, one of them was called Volodymyr (after Subject's younger brother).

Oleksiy's father was an agronomist or some other agricultural "worker". With his parents Oleksiy lived in CHORTKIV and TERNOPOL in West Ukraine and studied criminology in LVOV. Then he moved to the Foreign Ministry of Ukrainian SSR in Kiev. 1961 he was sent by the FM to Canada.

Subject's wife studies now English at the Institute of Foreign Languages in Kiev and has also to learn Ukrainian.

Subject's younger brother - Volodymyr - was born in 1940 in KREMENETS, West Ukraine. Now he was married, had one son - Oleksiy (after Subject's name,) worked as an engineer at a huge chemical plant in Kiev.

Subject did not like the United States, in particular socio-economic relations, and would not stay here not even for \$ 100,000. He seemed to be quite genuine in what he said, according to the source.

He likes beer but does not mind scotch either.